

Paul advises president to continue diplomacy and rule out force in Iraq *Says bombing Hussein will increase Arab distrust of US policies, lead to instability*
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Wednesday, November 19, 1997

[Read letter and position paper](#) referred to below. WASHINGTON, DC - In a letter sent to President Clinton today, US Representative Ron Paul (R-Surfside) urged the Commander-in-Chief to resist using force in Iraq, saying it will only worsen an already bad situation brought on by decades of interventionist US foreign policy.

"The real problem for the United States is not Saddam Hussein, but rather our foreign policy," Paul wrote. "I hope your administration will mark a radical departure from others of this century, by following the advice of our Founding Fathers."

In his letter, the Texas congressman said he was pleased the administration has in recent days embraced a diplomatic solution to the situation, noting that "the political pressures will be great" to escalate the situation and use military force. Paul described the use of the military in this situation as "unconstitutional and immoral."

In addition to his letter, Paul sent the president an enclosure which further detailed his opposition to the use of military force in Iraq. Entitled "Bombing Saddam will only increase Arab distrust of West," the position paper explains why US policy in the Middle East, and in relation to Iraq in specific, is doomed to fail.

Our policy dealing with Iraq, Paul writes, "totally ignores history, and reflects a lack of understanding of long-time justifiable Arab distrust of the West. The Middle East has been savaged and ruled by outsiders for a thousand years and U.N. quick-fixes will only aggravate this understandable resentment of those seen as foreign infidels."

Paul notes that "more bombs were dropped on Iraq (during the Persian Gulf War) than all the bombs dropped on Germany in World War II." And yet, he writes, "the instability remains and hatred toward America has increased... In this case, further bombing of Iraq would be a benefit to Hussein because his people rally around him."

He also discusses the lack of constitutional authority for US involvement in this situation;

authority which is critical if US lives are to be jeopardized by a military mission.

"There is no direct national security interests for us to be in Iraq. We are not the policeman of the world; we cannot afford it, and our interventionist efforts usually backfire... It could easily be argued that our national security is jeopardized by antagonizing and encouraging a confrontation with the Iraqi government."

Paul notes that the vile Iraqi leader is no worse than the leaders of nations which the US embraces as allies, friends and beneficiaries. The government of Turkey persecutes the Kurds in the same ruthless manner as Hussein, yet that country receives millions of dollars in aid from the US. Likewise, Saudia Arabia is notoriously hostile to the notion of civil liberties for women and religious minorities, yet that nation, too, gets the stamp of US approval. Recently, the US government began bailing-out the bankrupt - and tyrannical - regime in Indonesia, and political leaders in the US rolled out the red carpet for China's leader, despite that nation's well-known record for slaying dissidents and harming women and children.

"Human rights issues (regarding Iraq) are used to gain popular support through political propaganda," Paul wrote, but is obviously not a real factor. Instead, Paul suggests the real factor is "who is controlling the oil."

"Policy toward Iraq is based on the special interests of powerful financial and oil interests. It is not designed to protect US national security." Paul concludes by writing, "A policy designed to protect American security and promote neutrality and friendship with all nations would go a long way toward removing the serious threat to peace in the Middle East."

(30)